



D2

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Information data deleted to
prevent disclosure of information
in violation of personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: LIN-01-176-54423

Office: Nebraska Service Center

Date: JUN - 4 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

Petition: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

It is noted that the appeal has been filed by an attorney whose standing in this proceeding has not been demonstrated by the filing of a properly executed Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative (Form G-28). In the interest of due process, the matter will be reviewed on certification pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 103.4.

The petitioner is a university with 31,310 employees and a gross annual income of \$2.15 billion. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a medical staff development representative for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), provides in part for nonimmigrant classification to qualified aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(1), defines a "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner had not demonstrated that the beneficiary holds a baccalaureate degree or an equivalent. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the record contains a credentials evaluation to demonstrate that the beneficiary holds the equivalent of a bachelor of science degree in business administration with an emphasis in marketing.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, the alien must meet one of the following criteria:

1. Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
2. Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
3. Hold an unrestricted State license, registration, or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
4. Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

The beneficiary holds a baccalaureate degree in business administration conferred by a Pakistani institution. The record contains a transcript indicating that she also completed 15 graduate credits at another Pakistani institution. Her resume indicates that she spent two or three months in an internship as an assistant project manager. A credentials evaluation service concluded as follows:

The education of [the beneficiary], based on certificates, transcripts and progressively higher employment experience is equivalent to An Accredited American Bachelor of Science in Business Administration Degree with emphasis on Marketing. This educational program is equivalent to One Hundred Twenty-six Accredited American university or college credits.

This Service uses an independent evaluation of a person's foreign credentials in terms of education in the United States as an advisory opinion only. Where an evaluation is not in accord with previous equivalencies or is in any way questionable, it may be rejected or given less weight. See Matter of Sea, Inc., 19 I&N Dec. 817 (Comm. 1988).

Here, the evaluation of the beneficiary's foreign credentials is based on education and experience. (It is noted that it does not

appear that the evaluator included the beneficiary's graduate courses in his evaluation.) The evaluator has not demonstrated specifically how the evaluation was made nor the basis for making it (including copies of the relevant portions of any research materials used). Nor has the evaluator provided any details of the beneficiary's "progressively higher employment experience." Moreover, the record contains no evidence of such employment other than the information provided in the beneficiary's resume. As such, the petitioner has not demonstrated that such experience was experience in a specialty occupation.

Counsel states that the evaluation was performed by an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience, as required by 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1). The record, however, contains no evidence in support of such claim. It was held in Matter of Obaigbena, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988) and Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez, 17 I&N Dec. (BIA 1980) that the assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. As such, the evaluation is accorded little weight.

The beneficiary is not a member of any organizations whose usual prerequisite for entry is a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area. The record contains no evidence that the beneficiary holds a state license, registration, or certification which authorizes her to practice a specialty occupation. In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in a specialty occupation.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden. Accordingly, the decision of the director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.